

invention. The species listed were:

Specie I – acoustic transducer means (Fig. 1);

Specie II – Electromagnetic transducers or EMAT (Figs. 10A, B and C); and

Specie III – Optical, laser or laser vibrometer interferometer (Fig. 11).

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant restricted the parent application to Specie I, acoustic transducer means. Applicant subsequently filed the subject application as a divisional of parent application 09/028,536 and is currently prosecuting claims directed to Specie III - Optical, laser or laser vibrometer interferometer. In an Office Action dated February 5, 2002 in the subject application, the Examiner admitted that claims 22-25 "correspond to Specie III", i.e., optical, laser or laser vibrometer interferometer (Fig. 11).

Currently, the Examiner restricts the claims of the subject application to one of the following species:

Specie I – electromagnetic acoustic transducers (Figs. 10A, B and C);

Specie II – laser-based acoustic or ultrasound transducers (Fig. 11); and


Specie III – air coupled piezoelectric transducers (see Spec., pg. 9-10).

Applicant herein elects Specie II, which corresponds to Fig. 11 and all pending claims 22-29 of the subject application, with traverse. Applicant asserts that the present restriction requirement is unnecessary since, as noted above, in response to the Office Action dated April 25, 2000 in the parent case, Applicant previously restricted the claims to Specie III which also corresponds to Fig. 11.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,


David W. Poirier
Reg. No. 43,007